

one may trace, roughly, the north- and south-westerly progress of this *Apion* from its presumed arrival at a point on or near the coast in the Deal area shortly before 1962. *East Kent*: Deal, vii. 62; Brook, near Wye, vi.63; Dungeness, vii. 64; Chiddingstone, vii. 69; again at Deal, vii. 69; Wittersham (Rother Levels), ix. 69; Sandwich Bay, viii. 78 in some numbers on *Vicia cracca*, all records of E. G. Philp, who has found it also more recently in a good many other E. Kent localities. *East Sussex*: Milton Street (bank of R. Cuckmere), xi. 73; Little Horsted, vi. 74; Friston Forest, frequent, vi. 75-78; Plashett Wood, vi. 78 on *Lathyrus pratensis* (probably) in numbers: all records of P. J. Hodge, who tells me that *A. cerdo* appears now to be general in his part of the county, equally with its nearest relative *A. subulatum* Kby. On 21.vi.70 I swept a ♀ *cerdo* from a clump of the tufted vetch in the Devil's Dyke area of Brighton Downs; but it was getting late and there was no time to investigate further, and in any case the insect was passed as *subulatum* until much later. Mr. Hodge points out that this is farther west in Sussex than any of his captures, and also that the species has by now probably reached Surrey.

Finally I can report *A. cerdo* from S. E. London and W. Kent, where I took it last year: Woolwich Common, 1 ♀, 31.v.81, and Crockenhill, near Swanley, 2 ♀ ♀, 4.viii.81. In both places it was swept from mixed leguminous plants, including in the latter locality a little *V. cracca*.

I am obliged to the above-named gentlemen for sending me their records and suggesting that I publish them. — A. A. ALLEN.

JOHN ABBOT'S DRAWINGS AND NOTES FOR A PROPOSED SUPPLEMENT TO SMITH AND ABBOT, "THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE RARER LEPIDOPTEROUS INSECTS OF GEORGIA" (1797). — Since completion of my paper on "Smith and Abbot" (93:213-218) I have had relevant correspondence with Mr. J. E. Traue, Chief Librarian, The Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, N. Z. We agree that the Turnbull Library set of Abbot drawings is quite probably the one sent by Abbot to William Swainson in 1818 and is not, as Parkinson (Turnbull Library *Record*, 11, 1978, 26-36) supposed, the "book of Drawings" shipped to Swainson in 1835. The Turnbull set was intended to be published as a supplement to "Smith and Abbot," and Abbot also supplied Swainson with manuscript "Notes to the Drawings of Insects" as he had done when collaborating with Smith. (Actually Abbot furnished a number of customers with sets of drawings and notes which he 'advertised' as supplemental to the Smith volumes, but these appear to have been the only ones meant to be published as such.)

The identity of the drawings with those sent in 1818 is suggested by their number, 103 (one of the total of 104 to match "Smith and Abbot" having been lost; Swainson, *Taxidermy*, 1840, 99-100) and their relatively small size, 34.5 x 21 cm. As explained in my previous paper, Swainson objected that the drawings were not as highly finished as those used by Smith, and chiefly that they were "much smaller in size so that they can never be bound uniformly with that work." In addition to his plans for publication, Swainson wished to bind his original Abbot drawings to match a book which

averages 41.5 cm. in height. Abbot promised a larger set, and could hardly have made the same 'error' again.

Another proof is the content of the Turnbull drawings (Parkinson, 1978). In their correspondence, Swainson initially agreed to Abbot's idea of including drawings of "some of the other Genera of Insects" in the set of *Papilio* and *Sphinx*, writing on the 25th October 1817 that "A few drawings of the other Genera of Insects would also be welcome, if accompanied by their metamorphos." The Turnbull drawings do indeed depict other insects, and not all Lepidoptera. These must have been the drawings Swainson complained about on the 28th January 1819 when he wrote (contradicting himself): "I only wish to have drawings of the Papillios & Sphinxes which are not in Smith."

Perhaps the replacement set was never provided, for when reporting the abandonment of the project in *Taxidermy*, Swainson mentioned only the short set of 103 drawings. The location of the 1835 "book of Drawings" is unknown, and it is uncertain whether these figured in the publication scheme at all. At least we know from the drawings and notes in the Turnbull Library (Parkinson, 1978) what the two supplementary volumes to "Smith and Abbot" would have contained had Swainson been satisfied with Abbot's efforts at the time.

In his article Parkinson mentions the manuscript "Notes" as "in a hand which may be Abbot's." I have obtained photocopies which prove that the notes are certainly in Abbot's distinctive hand, and in character are much like the observations used by Smith. — RONALD S. WILKINSON, 228 Ninth Street, N. E., Washington, D. C. 20002.

SWIMMING BEHAVIOUR IN *HYPERA RUMICIS* (LINNAEUS) (COL: CURCULIONIDAE). — During May 1981 I tested a few species of weevils (Curculionidae) for swimming ability, and among some other species I discovered that *Hypera rumicis* (Linnaeus) was capable of swimming quite efficiently. When a few adults of the weevil were placed in a small water filled plastic dish they were, after a brief period, observed to swim through the water fairly rapidly by making a definite breast 'stroke action' with all six legs. The actual swimming was performed by extending the forelegs first in a wide arc then the mid and hind pairs were brought into action at the same time, thus providing the necessary forward movement. Progress through the water was mainly by alternating movements of each pair of legs, but the greatest effectual stroke was made by the forelegs. The specimens of *H. rumicis* were also capable of performing the same swimming stroke while on their backs. Movement through the water was quite rapid in either position and this was especially noticeable when the temperature of the water was raised slightly.

The swimming action in *H. rumicis* was very similar to that of *Ceutorhynchus viduatus* Gyllenhal previously reported by me, (1978, *Entomologist's Gaz.* 29: 76) and it also appears to resemble, to some extent the motion and style performed by *Litodactylus leucogaster* (Marshall), as described recently in a paper dealing with